



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,462	03/28/2001	Carl Steven Baumann	END9 2000 0165 US1	3427

44755 7590 03/05/2007  
SHELLEY M. BECKSTRAND  
PATENT ATTORNEY  
61 GLENMONT ROAD  
WOODLAWN, VA 24381

EXAMINER
----------

MILEF, ELDA G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3692

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/05/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/819,462	BAUMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elda Milef	3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-9, 14-16 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10-13, 17 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1,10-13, 17,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

**Regarding claims 1, 13, 17,19:** The Examiner could not find sufficient support in the specification detailing how the generation of a goods receipt is used to approve and pay for an invoice.

**Claims 10-12** are rejected because of their dependency to the rejected claims.

Art Unit: 3692

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

For examination purposes, the Examiner is interpreting generating a goods receipt for approving an invoice to mean comparing an invoice to a receipt.

2. Claims 1, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,507,826 Maners in view of *University of New Hampshire Financial and Administrative Procedures*, hereinafter, *Procedures*.

**With respect to Claim 1**, Maners discloses the invention substantially as claimed including in a method for approving and paying an invoice for commodities (Abstract), the steps of:

Art Unit: 3692

receiving a requisition from a requestor of commodities  
(Col. 2, lines 6-26);

marking said commodities upon said requisition as  
receivable commodities (inherent to commodities deemed to  
require invoice authorization for payment; associated receiving  
ticket requires recipient confirmation);

receiving said invoice for commodities from a vendor  
(Col. 8, lines 59-62);

matching said invoice to said purchase order and  
determining if said invoice relates to an item designated on  
said invoice as receivable(col. 5, lines 40-58; Col. 6, lines 6-  
67; col. 8, lines 21-29 and Figure 4 (Invoice number, order  
number, Refused status);

generating from said invoice a notification to an  
authorizer that includes information needed pay the invoice and  
choices of authorizing or rejecting payment (Col. 8, line 63 to  
Col. 9, line 50);

for commodities marked as receivable, executing a  
positive confirmation process (Col. 6, lines 6-20; Col. 8, line  
63 to Col.9, line 52), including:

responsive to authorization by said authorizer, creating  
an automated receipt transaction file and entering said  
transaction file into a payment system (Col. 9, lines 38-44)

Art Unit: 3692

within an enterprise resource planning system (Col. 3, line 59 to Col. 4, line 3 and Col. 6, line 21 to Col. 10, line 17); and

responsive to rejection by said requestor, creating an e-mail notification to accounts payable for returning said invoice to said vendor (Col. 6, lines 38-67; Col. 9, lines 44-52 and Col.8, lines 21-29);

for commodities marked as non-receivable, executing a negative confirmation process (Col. 5, lines 40-58).

Maners further discloses the use of buttons to select among alternatives (Figs. 4-9) and alternative selection between authorizing (approved) and rejecting (refused) invoices (Fig. 3). Maners does not specifically disclose that a button is used to select between these alternatives. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Maners to use a selection button to authorize or reject an invoice because this would provide a familiar and easily used interface element for an authorizer to indicate such a choice.

Maners further discloses positive and negative "processing"; the "processing" is directly related to positive or negative approvals of invoices for purchased commodities, as cited. At best, Applicant might argue that a "marking" is not disclosed. Official Notice is taken that such marking is well

Art Unit: 3692

known for positive confirmations in accounting. For example, it is customary for businesses to identify invoices above a certain dollar amount for review, and to allow low dollar invoices to be paid without review. Applicant admits this in "Background Art" of the Specification. Similarly, it is proper audit practice to exclude expense items below designated value from audit review. Exclusion of low value amounts is done to save processing/auditing costs; positive confirmation of select transactions reduces accounting fraud or errors. The Examiner makes these observations having worked professionally as an accountant for nine years. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention to specifically modify Maners to "mark" orders for positive and negative confirmation to "separate the wheat" (receivable transactions requiring positive confirmation from the "chaff" (non-receivable transactions requiring negative confirmation).

The Claims further recite limitation of a three-way match among invoice, purchase order and received goods. Maners does not specifically disclose this limitation. Procedures discloses this limitation pages 1-11, particularly page 1, underlined text and pages 3, 5, 8, and 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Art Unit: 3692

Maners to include the three way matching disclosed by Procedures because this would have assured that goods ordered were indeed delivered per purchase order and approved by recipient.

**Concerning Claim 10**, Maners does not specifically disclose scheduled sending of payment acceptances to a backend procurement system. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to schedule financial data transfers for regular transmission. For example, batch processing was a familiar way to transfer data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform such data transfer in Maners because this would provide timely, predictable workloads for the system. As to the front-end and back-end descriptions of systems, they are not claimed in level of detail so as to clearly demark them.

**With respect to Claim 12**, Maners does not specifically disclose notification of a confirmation notice at login. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to provide important information to a user upon first access to a data system. For example, the notification "You've got mail!" was used to draw a user's attention to new incoming e-mail. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Maners to include such notification upon login because this would provide timely



Art Unit: 3692

notification of a user of important information regarding payment authorization.

3. Claims 13, 17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maners in view of Procedures as applied to claim 1 above in further view of Furphy et al. (hereinafter Furphy, US Patent 6,882,983).

**Concerning Claim 13**, see the discussion of Claims 1 and 10. Furthermore, Furphy discloses a system of authorizing a payment of an invoice by comparing the invoice to a receipt.-see cols. 1 to 3; col. 15 lines 34-64 in particular comparing purchase order data, the invoice data and the receipt data. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maners and Procedures to specifically include authorizing payment by comparing purchase order data with invoice data and receipt data as taught by Furphy in order to reduce redundancies in the discrepancy resolution process and reduce the unnecessary administrative infrastructure associated with the processing of invoices and purchase orders.

**With respect to Claim 17**, see the discussion of Claims 1 and 13 above and Maners further discloses a program storage

Art Unit: 3692

device embodying instructions to perform the recited steps at Fig. 2, ele. 202 and related text. Furthermore, Maners teaches determining if an item for goods on said invoice is for a commodity item marked on said purchase order as receivable or non-receivable. -see col. 7 lines 25-col. 8 line 5 and cols. 1-2, Fig. 4 and related text. Maners teaches ("This purchase order information is considered part of the reference data 218 that is exchanged between the company accounting system 206 and the MicroEDI Database 214 via the local area network 204.) It is obvious that for the authorization for an invoice to be paid, and for the invoice to reflect the status as posted, incomplete, ready or refused, the information included in the purchase order is exchanged between the systems disclosed by Maners.

**With respect to Claim 19,** see the discussion of Claims 1 and 17.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maners in view Procedures and further in view of US 5,970,475 Barnes et al.

**Concerning Claim 11,** see the discussion of Claim 10. Maners does not specifically disclose posting receipts for which payment is accepted. Barnes discloses posting as receipts

Art Unit: 3692

items for which payment is accepted at Col. 23, lines 36-43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Maners to include the posting of accepted payments of Barnes because this would facilitate completion of payment processing.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10-13, 17, and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Examiner notes that the applicant has not argued against official notices cited in claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, which indicates that the applicant is accepting the official notice as well known facts or accepting that the limitations are old and well known. -see MPEP §2144.03 (C).

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this

Art Unit: 3692

action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elda Milef whose telephone number is (571)272-8124. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:30 am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on (571)272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3692

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Elda Milef  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3692

\*\*\*



RICHARD E. CHILCOT, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER